This section discusses additional topics statutorily required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), including growth-inducing impacts, significant irreversible environmental effects, significant and unavoidable environmental effects, and a summary of cumulative effects.

5.1 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

INTRODUCTION

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d) requires that an EIR evaluate the growth-inducing impacts of a proposed action. A growth-inducing impact is defined by CEQA Guidelines as:

> *…the ways in which a proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects which would remove obstacles to population growth…It must not be assumed that growth in an area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.*

A project can have direct and/or indirect growth inducement potential. Direct growth inducement would result if, for example, a project involved construction of new housing. A project would have indirect growth inducement potential if, for example, it established substantial new permanent employment opportunities (e.g., commercial, industrial, or governmental enterprises) or if it would involve a construction effort with substantial short-term employment opportunities that would indirectly stimulate the need for additional housing and services to support the new employment demand. Similarly, a project would indirectly induce growth if, for example, it would remove an obstacle to additional growth and development, such as removing a constraint on a required public service. A project providing an increased water supply in an area where water service historically limited growth could be considered growth inducing.

The CEQA Guidelines further explain that the environmental effects of induced growth are considered indirect impacts of the proposed action. These indirect impacts or secondary effects of growth may result in significant, adverse environmental impacts. Potential secondary effects of growth include increased demand on community and public services and infrastructure, increased traffic and noise, and adverse environmental impacts such as degradation of air and water quality, degradation or loss of plant and animal habitat, and conversion of agricultural and open space land to developed uses.

Growth inducement may constitute an adverse impact if the growth is not consistent with or accommodated by the land use plans and growth management plans and policies for the area affected. Local land use plans include land use development patterns and growth policies that allow the orderly expansion of urban development supported by adequate urban public services, such as water supply, roadway infrastructure, sewer service, and solid waste service.

COMPONENTS OF GROWTH

As required by Government Code Section 65300, the Placer County General Plan is intended to serve as the overall plan for the physical development of the county. While the General Plan does not specifically propose any development projects, it does regulate the location and type of future development and thus controls future county population and economic growth that would result in indirect growth-inducing effects.

The project site is designated High Density Residential-Density Factor 20 (HDR DF-20) in the Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance as well as in the Placer County General Plan. Therefore, the Placer County General Plan assumed that the project site would generate residential growth.

GROWTH EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Changes in population and employment are not in and of themselves environmental impacts. However, they may result in the need for the construction of new housing, businesses, infrastructure, and services that provide for increases in population and employment. Following is a discussion of the proposed project's potential to generate growth in the project area and the anticipated effects of such growth. The reader is also referred to Section 4.10, Population and Housing, of this Draft EIR for a detailed discussion of the existing demographics and characteristics of the project area.

Population Growth

The project proposes the construction of 63 residential units, which would result in an increase in population of approximately 139, based on a persons-per-household factor of 2.20 (63 X 2.20 = 138.6). In addition, although not part of the proposed project, this analysis conservatively assumes that half of the single-family units would in the future develop a second unit ("granny unit"). Assuming the same persons-per-household factor for the 17 second units, the total on-site population would be 176 (80 X 2.20 = 176). It is likely that a portion of the housing units on-site would be second or vacation homes and would not have permanent residents. However, conservatively assuming all 176 residents are permanent, this would represent a 12.9 percent increase of the population of the subject Zip Code Tabulation Area and a 0.16 percent increase in the county's unincorporated population (US Census Bureau 2010; DOF 2015). These percentages are not considered substantial increases in the overall population of the region and would not exceed projected growth in the county.

Employment Growth

The project does not propose the development of any businesses or other uses that would directly create new employment opportunities in the project area. However, the project may result in indirect employee growth in the region and would be required to provide employee housing for 50 percent of the full-time equivalent employees generated by the project consistent with Placer County Housing Element Policy C-2. The reader is referred to mitigation measure MM 4.10.2 in Section 4.10, Population and Housing, of this EIR.

Other Economic-Related Growth

The proposed project would increase economic activity through the short-term creation of jobs during construction. However, the existing number of residents in the county and other nearby areas who are employed in the construction industry would be sufficient to meet the demand for construction workers that would be generated by the project. As such, substantial population growth or increases in housing demand in the region as a result of these jobs is not anticipated.

Economic activities associated with project operations could also result in indirect growth in the region. Demands for residential goods and services (e.g., grocery stores, landscaping services, contractors, cleaning services) could result in demand for new retail space and other commercial activities. Whether or not this would lead to construction of new space or expansion of existing facilities is speculative. However, if new construction were to occur in the region, it

could result in potential environmental impacts, depending on where the new construction would occur.

The proposed project would also increase demand for public services and utilities, including water supply, wastewater, electrical power, propane, fire protection, public schools, snow removal, and recreational facilities. However, as discussed in Section 4.11, Public Services and Utilities, the proposed development could be served by existing facilities and no new or expanded off-site facilities would be required. Furthermore, the project would not extend infrastructure to areas outside the project boundaries that are not already served, nor would it provide additional capacity.

5.2 ENERGY CONSERVATION

INTRODUCTION

Public Resources Code Section 21100(b)(3) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4 require EIRs to describe, where relevant, the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy caused by a project. In 1975, largely in response to the oil crisis of the 1970s, the California Legislature adopted Assembly Bill (AB) 1575, which created the California Energy Commission (CEC). The CEC's statutory mission is to forecast future energy needs, license thermal power plants of 50 megawatts or larger, develop energy technologies and renewable energy resources, plan for and direct state responses to energy emergencies, and—perhaps most importantly—promote energy efficiency through the adoption and enforcement of appliance and building energy efficiency standards. AB 1575 also amended Public Resources Code Section 21100(b)(3) to require EIRs to consider the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy caused by a project. Thereafter, the State Resources Agency created Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines.

CEQA Guidelines Appendix F is an advisory document that assists EIR preparers in determining whether a project will result in the inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy. For the reasons set forth below, this EIR concludes that the proposed project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy and therefore would not create a significant impact relative to energy resources.

BACKGROUND

Energy usage is typically quantified using the British thermal unit (BTU). As a point of reference, the approximate amounts of energy contained in common energy sources are as follows:

Energy Source	BTUs
Gasoline	124,000 per gallon
Diesel Fuel	139,000 per gallon
Propane	91,420 per gallon
Electricity	3,414 per kilowatt-hour

Sources: USDOE 2013

Total energy usage in California was 7,858 trillion BTUs in 2011, which equates to an average of 209 million BTUs per capita. Of California's total energy usage, the breakdown by sector is 38.3 percent transportation, 22.8 percent industrial, 19.6 percent commercial, and 19.3 percent residential. Petroleum satisfies 43 percent of California's energy demand, natural gas 28 percent,

electricity 11 percent, and renewables 12 percent. Nuclear electric power accounts for less than 5 percent and coal fuel less than 1 percent of California's total energy demand. Electricity and natural gas in California are generally consumed by stationary users such as residences and commercial and industrial facilities, whereas petroleum consumption is generally accounted for by transportation-related energy use (EIA 2014).

Given the nature of the proposed project, the following discussion focuses on the sources of energy that are most relevant to the project—electricity and propane for the proposed residential units, and transportation fuel for vehicle trips associated with the project.

Current Energy Use

The project site is undeveloped and does not consume any energy.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS

Federal and state agencies regulate energy use and consumption through various means and programs. At the federal level, the US Department of Transportation, the US Department of Energy, and the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) are three agencies with substantial influence over energy policies and programs. Generally, federal agencies influence and regulate transportation energy consumption through the establishment and enforcement of fuel economy standards for automobiles and light trucks, through funding of energy-related research and development projects, and through funding for transportation infrastructure improvements. At the state level, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) and the California Energy Commission are two agencies with authority over different aspects of energy. The CPUC regulates privately owned utilities in the energy, rail, telecommunications, and water fields. The CEC collects and analyzes energy-related data, prepares statewide energy policy recommendations and plans, promotes and funds energy efficiency programs, and adopts and enforces appliance and building energy efficiency standards. California is exempt under federal law from setting state fuel economy standards for new on-road motor vehicles. Some of the more relevant federal and state energy-related laws and plans are discussed below.

FEDERAL

Energy Policy and Conservation Act

The Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975 sought to ensure that all vehicles sold in the United States would meet certain fuel economy goals. Through this act, Congress established the first fuel economy standards for on-road motor vehicles in the country. Pursuant to the act, the National Highway Traffic and Safety Administration, which is part of the US Department of Transportation, is responsible for establishing additional vehicle standards and for revising existing standards. Since 1990, the fuel economy standard for new passenger cars has been 27.5 miles per gallon. Since 1996, the fuel economy standard for new light trucks (gross vehicle weight of 8,500 pounds or less) has been 20.7 miles per gallon. Heavy-duty vehicles (i.e., vehicles and trucks over 8,500 pounds gross vehicle weight) are not currently subject to fuel economy standards. Compliance with federal fuel economy standards is not determined for each individual vehicle model; rather, compliance is determined based on each manufacturer's average fuel economy for the portion of their vehicles produced for sale in the United States. The Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) program, which is administered by the EPA, was created to determine vehicle manufacturers' compliance with the fuel economy standards. The EPA calculates a CAFE value for each manufacturer, based on city and highway fuel economy test results and vehicle sales. On the basis of the information generated under the CAFE

program, the US Department of Transportation is authorized to assess penalties for noncompliance. In the course of its more than 30-year history, this regulatory program has resulted in vastly improved fuel economy throughout the nation's vehicle fleet.

Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) promoted the development of intermodal transportation systems to maximize mobility as well as address national and local interests in air quality and energy. ISTEA contained factors that metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) such as the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) were required to address in developing transportation plans and programs, including some energy-related factors. To meet the new ISTEA requirements, MPOs adopted explicit policies defining the social, economic, energy, and environmental values which were to guide transportation decisions in that metropolitan area. The planning process for specific projects would then address these policies. Another requirement was to consider the consistency of transportation planning with federal, state, and local energy goals. Through these requirements, energy consumption was expected to become a decision criterion, along with cost and other values that determine the best transportation solution.

Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century

The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) was signed into law in 1998 and builds on the initiatives established in the ISTEA legislation discussed above. TEA-21 authorizes highway, highway safety, transit, and other efficient surface transportation programs. TEA-21 continues the program structure established for highways and transit under ISTEA, such as flexibility in the use of funds, emphasis on measures to improve the environment, and focus on a strong planning process as the foundation of good transportation decisions. TEA-21 also provides for investment in research and its application to maximize the performance of the transportation system through, for example, deployment of intelligent transportation systems, to help improve operations and management of transportation systems and vehicle safety.

STATE

State of California Energy Plan

The CEC is responsible for preparing the State Energy Plan, which identifies emerging trends related to energy supply, demand, conservation, public health and safety, and the maintenance of a healthy economy. The plan calls for the State to assist in the transformation of the transportation system to improve air quality, reduce congestion, and increase the efficient use of fuel supplies with the least environmental and energy costs. To further this policy, the plan identifies a number of strategies, including providing assistance to public agencies and fleet operators, encouraging urban designs that reduce vehicle miles traveled, and accommodating pedestrian and bicycle access.

Title 24, Energy Efficiency Standards

The California Energy Code (Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations, California's Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings) provides energy conservation standards for all new and renovated commercial and residential buildings constructed in California. The provisions of the California Energy Code apply to the building envelope, space-conditioning systems, and water-heating and lighting systems of buildings and appliances; they also give guidance on construction techniques to maximize energy

conservation. Minimum efficiency standards are given for a variety of building elements, including appliances, water and space heating and cooling equipment, and insulation for doors, pipes, walls, and ceilings. The CEC adopted the 2005 changes to the Building Efficiency Standards, which emphasized saving energy during peak periods and seasons, and improving the quality of installation of energy efficiency measures. It is estimated that implementation of the 2005 Title 24 standards has resulted in an increased energy savings of 8.5 percent relative to the previous Title 24 standards. Compliance with Title 24 standards is verified and enforced through the local building permit process. The 2008 Title 24 Standards, which had an effective date beginning August 1, 2009, include added provisions that require, for example, "cool roofs" on commercial buildings; increased efficiency in heating, ventilating, and air conditioning systems; and increased use of skylights and more efficient lighting systems. California's Building Energy Efficiency Standards are updated on an approximately three-year cycle. The 2013 standards continue to improve upon the previous standards for new construction of, and additions and alterations to, residential and nonresidential buildings. The 2013 standards went into effect on July 1, 2014.

LOCAL

Placer County General Plan

Following is a list of relevant General Plan goals and policies.

Goal H. To increase the efficiency of energy use in new and existing homes with a concurrent reduction in housing costs for Placer County residents.

Policy G-1. The County shall require that all new dwelling units meet current State requirements for energy efficiency, and encourage developers to exceed Title 24 requirements. Retrofitting of existing units shall be encouraged.

Policy G-2. The County shall promote land use patterns that encourage energy efficiency, to the extent feasible, and encourage efficient energy use in new development, including but not limited to access to non-auto transit, use of traffic demand management, and water-efficient landscaping.

Policy G-3. The County shall continue to implement provisions of the Subdivision Map Act that require subdivisions to be oriented for solar access, to the extent practical.

Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance

The Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance, adopted in 1983, contains the following information relevant to energy use.

Section 146 – Energy Conservation. A bonus in the permitted floor area ratio and density factor shall be granted for projects which use active or passive solar applications to reduce space heating demand. The bonus shall be equal to one percent of the floor area ratio and/or density factor for each 10% reduction in space heating demand.

CEQA GUIDELINES

CEQA Guidelines Appendix F requires that EIRs contain a discussion of the potential energy impacts of a project with an emphasis on reducing the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary

consumption of energy. CEQA Guidelines Appendix F further states that the means of achieving the goal of energy conservation include the following:

- Decreasing overall per capita energy consumption.
- Decreasing reliance on fossil fuels such as coal, natural gas, and oil.
- Increasing reliance on renewable energy sources.

PROJECT ENERGY CONSUMPTION AND CONSERVATION

As described previously, the proposed project would introduce energy usage on a site that is currently undeveloped and thus uses no energy. The project would consume energy in both the short term during project construction and in the long term during project operation.

Construction Phase

During construction, the project would consume energy in two general forms: (1) the fuel energy consumed by construction vehicles and equipment; and (2) bound energy in construction materials, such as asphalt, steel, concrete, pipes, and manufactured or processed materials, such as lumber and glass.

Energy Consumed by Construction Vehicles and Equipment

Fossil fuels used for construction vehicles and other energy-consuming equipment would be used during site grading, paving, and construction and would be temporary in nature. Fuel use calculations for the proposed project are provided in **Appendix 5.0**. Fuel use associated with construction activities was based on estimated equipment assumptions, as well as vehicle trips identified in the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) computer modeling conducted for the project (see Section 4.2, Air Quality, and **Appendix 5.0**). In total, project construction would use approximately 87,389 gallons of diesel fuel for an estimated total of approximately 12.2 billion BTUs (CARB 2011).

Bound Energy Contained in Construction Materials

Construction of the proposed project would require large amounts of construction materials such as concrete, asphalt, steel, lumber, and glass, which require energy to acquire, manufacture, process, and transport. Given high fuel prices, contractors and owners have a strong financial incentive to use recycled materials and products originating from nearby sources in order to reduce the costs of transportation. Furthermore, it is reasonable to assume that production of building materials would employ all reasonable energy conservation practices in the interest of minimizing the cost of doing business. Therefore, it is expected that materials used in construction would not involve the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy.

Operational Phase

The operational phase of the proposed project would consume energy for multiple purposes including but not limited to building heating and cooling, water heating, lighting, and electronics. Electricity and natural gas usage calculations for the proposed project are provided in **Appendix 5.0**. In total, project operation would use approximately 3.1 billion BTUs (CARB 2011).

Energy would also be consumed during each vehicle trip associated with the proposed development. Transportation energy is discussed separately below.

Energy Conservation During Operation

The project would be required to comply with Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, which provide minimum efficiency standards related to various building features, including appliances, water and space heating and cooling equipment, building insulation and roofing, and lighting. Implementation of the Title 24 standards significantly reduces energy usage, and it is generally assumed that compliance with Title 24 ensures projects will not result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of energy.

Transportation

Transportation Energy Consumption and Conservation

Vehicle trips associated with the proposed project would result in the consumption of an estimated 160 gallons of gasoline daily, or 58,400 gallons annually (CARB 2011). Therefore, the proposed project would consume annually an estimated 7.2 billion BTUs of energy for transportation purposes.

While these trips would be new trips to the project site, as noted above, the vehicle fleet is subject to the federal Energy Policy and Conservation Act, which regulates fuel efficiency for automobiles. Therefore, fuel use by automobiles traveling to and from the project would improve as the vehicle fleet improves and would not be considered wasteful or inefficient.

CONCLUSION

In summary, operation of the proposed project would result in the consumption of electricity and propane for project operation. Additional BTUs of gasoline and diesel fuels would be consumed during construction and for auto trips of residents and visitors of the proposed development. However, compliance with Title 24 and continuous improvements in vehicle fleet fuel efficiency as required under federal law would reduce project energy consumption. Therefore, although the project would result in the consumption of energy from multiple sources, it would not result in a significant impact to energy resources, as it would not use energy in an inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary manner. It is also important to note that the project would consist of infill and would avoid unnecessary energy usage from development of currently undeveloped areas of the Placer County that would involve energy consumption from the extension of public services and utilities where they do not currently exist.

5.3 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(b) requires an EIR to discuss unavoidable significant environmental effects, including those that can be mitigated but not reduced to a level of insignificance. In addition, Section 15093(a) of the CEQA Guidelines allows the decision-making agency to determine whether the benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts of implementing the project. The County can approve a project with unavoidable adverse impacts if it prepares a Statement of Overriding Considerations setting forth the specific reasons for making such a judgment.

No significant and unavoidable impacts are identified in the Draft EIR.

5.4 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS SUMMARY

This section summarizes the cumulative impacts associated with the proposed project that are identified in the environmental issue areas in Sections 4.1 through 4.12. Cumulative impacts are the result of combining the potential effects of the proposed project with other recently approved, planned, and reasonably foreseeable development projects in the region. The reader is referred to Sections 4.1 through 4.12 for a full discussion of the proposed project's cumulative impacts.

INTRODUCTION

CEQA requires that an EIR contain an assessment of the cumulative impacts that could be associated with the proposed project. According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(a), "an EIR shall discuss cumulative impacts of a project when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable." *Cumulatively considerable* means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects (as defined by Section 15130). As defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15355, a cumulative impact consists of an impact that is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts. A cumulative impact occurs from:

> *…the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time.*

In addition, Section 15130(b) identifies that the following three elements are necessary for an adequate cumulative analysis:

1) Either:

   a. A list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency; or

   b. A summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document which has been adopted or certified, which described or evaluated regional or area wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact. Any such planning document shall be referenced and made available to the public at a location specified by the lead agency.

2) A summary of the expected environmental effects to be produced by those projects with specific reference to additional information stating where that information is available; and

3) A reasonable analysis of the cumulative impacts of the relevant projects. An EIR shall examine reasonable, feasible options for mitigating or avoiding the project's contribution to any significant cumulative effects.

Where a lead agency is examining a project with an incremental effect that is not cumulatively considerable, the lead agency is not required to consider that effect significant, but must briefly describe its basis for concluding that the incremental effect is not cumulatively considerable.

CUMULATIVE IMPACT APPROACH

The cumulative setting for the proposed project includes all past, present, and probable future development as identified in the Placer County General Plan Update EIR, the Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance, the Martis Valley Community Plan EIR, the Town of Truckee General Plan Update EIR, the Nevada County General Plan Update EIR, and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) Regional Plan Update EIS.

Development in Squaw Valley began in the late 1940s with the opening of the 50-room Squaw Valley Ski Resort and continued with preparation for the 1960 Winter Olympics in the 1950s, including expanded ski facilities and development of visitor facilities. Since that time, residential and commercial development has been developed throughout the Valley including the Squaw Valley Lodge, the PlumpJack Squaw Valley Inn, the Olympic Village Inn, the Resort at Squaw Creek, the Village at Squaw Valley, and various single-family and condominium developments.

Table 5.0-1 provides the status of large-scale development projects in eastern Placer County. This list of projects was used in the development and analysis of the cumulative settings for the project. Please note that this list is not intended to be an inclusive list of all projects in the region.

Significance thresholds, unless otherwise specified, are the same for cumulative impacts as project impacts for each environmental topic area described in Sections 4.1 through 4.12.

TABLE 5.0-1
PROPOSED AND APPROVED PROJECTS IN THE VICINITY OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Project Title	Location	Description	Residential Units and/or Nonresidential Area	Status
Truckee Railyard Master Plan	Eastern end of historic downtown Truckee	Mixed commercial and residential development; includes Trout Creek District (6 acres of primarily mixed housing), Industrial Heritage District (8.5 acres of office, residential, and mixed-use buildings), and Downtown Extension District (12 acres of commercial development)	570 residential units, 70,000 square feet of retail, 15,000 square feet of office space, 60-room hotel, movie theater, 20,000-square-foot grocery store, and 25,000-square-foot civic building	Adopted in 2009. An amended master plan was submitted October 5, 2015 and is currently under review.
Coldstream Specific Plan	Coldstream Road south of I-80, Truckee	Planned community	345 residential units, including affordable housing units; 30,000 square feet of commercial	Project approved and EIR certified on September 23, 2014.
Pollard Station, A Senior Neighborhood	10335 Old Brockway Road, Truckee (west of Pine Cone Road terminus, at Hilltop)	Age-restricted senior neighborhood: lodge and condominiums (8 acres in the Hilltop Master Plan area)	86-unit senior lodge and 40 two-bedroom condominium units	Revised application submitted January 2013. MND released October 2014.
Joerger Ranch Specific Plan	Intersection of SR 267, Brockway Road, and Soaring Way, Truckee	70-acre mixed-use planned community including industrial, office space, public facility, transportation, and apartment uses	318 dwelling units	Town Council certified EIR and adopted Specific Plan on March 24, 2015.
Northstar Mountain Master Plan	5001 Northstar Drive, Truckee	Mountain Master Plan for the existing ski resort area. Various additions and changes to ski lifts, snowmaking, trails, bridges, access, ropes course, bike trails, and campsites		Final EIR released in June 2014. Project put on hold by applicant. Final EIR has not yet been certified and project entitlement requests have not yet been approved. Project buildout dates unknown.
Northstar Highlands Phase II	Northstar Drive, Truckee	Modifications to the original subdivision approval, reducing the development area and number of housing units (from 576 to 446 units)	50 townhomes, 10 single-family lots, and 386 condominiums for a total of 446 units; up to 147 nonresidential and commercial condominiums and 4,000 square feet of commercial space	Initial study checklist has been prepared.

Project Title	Location	Description	Residential Units and/or Nonresidential Area	Status
Cabin Creek Biomass Facility Project	900 Cabin Creek Road, Truckee	Development of a two megawatt wood-to-energy facility that would utilize a gasification technology; would support fuels reduction and thinning activities within and outside of the Lake Tahoe Basin; fueled by forest-sourced material only		Final EIR certified and project approved by Board of Supervisors on May 7, 2013. Project is progressing but has not yet been constructed as of this writing.
Truckee River Corridor Access Plan	Truckee River Watershed, Placer and Nevada counties	Continuous and coordinated system of preserved lands and habitat, with a connecting corridor of walking, in-line skating, equestrian, bicycle trails, and angling and boating access from Lake Tahoe to the Martis Valley		Application submitted; design and environmental review under way.
Squaw Valley Red Dog Lift Replacement	Terminus of Squaw Valley Road, west of State Route 89, Squaw Valley	Replacement of existing triple chairlift with a high-speed, detachable, 6-person chairlift		Mitigated Negative Declaration and project approved on March 28, 2013, by Planning Commission, but project not constructed as of this writing.
Siberia Lift Replacement	Terminus of Squaw Valley Road, west of SR 89, Squaw Valley	Replacement of existing 4-person chairlift with a high-speed, detachable, 6-person chairlift; total lift capacity would not increase		Mitigated Negative Declaration and project approved in March 2015 by Planning Commission. Construction completed in 2015.
Alpine Sierra Subdivision	Terminus of Alpine Meadows Road near Alpine Meadows Ski Resort	45.5-acre planned development to include single-family lots and commonly held parcels	33 single-family residential units and 14 residential halfplex units	NOP circulated in spring 2014. EIR is currently being prepared.
Alpine Meadows Hot Wheels Lift Replacement	Alpine Meadows Ski Resort, Alpine Meadows	Replacement of existing triple chairlift with a detachable quad chairlift		Environmental review complete; project approved in December 2012.
Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan	5145 Westlake Boulevard, Homewood	Redevelopment of mixed uses at the North Base area, residential uses at the South Base area, a lodge at the Mid-Mountain Base area, and ski area		EIR/EIS certified and project approved in December 2011. Construction expected in 2016.
Martis Camp	1200 Lodgetrail Drive, Truckee	Private golf and ski club community of upscale second homes	663 lots (between 2.5 and 0.5 acres) on over 2,000 acres	Opened in 2006. Partially built out. Many homes and community facilities are in place, but there are also lots available.

Project Title	Location	Description	Residential Units and/or Nonresidential Area	Status
Martis Valley West Parcel	Northstar	Mixed residential uses (including single-family, townhomes, cabins, condos) and commercial development (including resort services, fitness center, family entertainment, and community center)	760 residential units, homeowner amenities, and approximately 34,500 square feet of commercial development	Application complete. NOP released in April 2014. Initial application included 112 acres in Tahoe Basin. Project revised to remove all basin land, and revised NOP circulated in February 2015. Draft EIR circulated for public review ending December 22, 2015. Final EIR out for public review as of the date of this writing.
Lake Tahoe Passenger Ferry	Cross-lake ferry service with a South Shore Ferry Terminal at the Ski Run Marina in South Lake Tahoe and a North Shore Ferry Terminal at the Grove Street Pier west of the Tahoe City Marina	Year-round waterborne transit between north and south shores of Lake Tahoe		NOP/NOI released in November 2013. Project approval expected in 2016.
Caltrans' Highway Improvement Projects	SR 267	Planned improvements (those included in a long-term plan that can be funded) and programmed improvements (those included in a near-term programming document that identifies funding amounts by year) in the 2012 Transportation Corridor Concept Report for SR 267 include widening to four lanes between the Placer County line and Northstar Drive, rehabilitating pavement and widening shoulders between Placer County line and Brockway Summit, plant establishment and protection from Northstar Drive to SR 28, Class II bike lane from Brockway Summit to SR 28		Anticipated construction between 2014 and 2025.

Project Title	Location	Description	Residential Units and/or Nonresidential Area	Status
Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan	Squaw Valley	Expansion of the existing Village at Squaw Valley.		Final EIR circulated April 2016. Public hearing expected to begin August 2016
Resort at Squaw Creek Phase 2	Squaw Valley	Resort expansion	441 condo units (464 bedrooms)	Approved.
Olympic Estates	Squaw Valley	Residential development	16 residential units (64 bedrooms)	Approved.
Squaw Valley Ranch Estates	Squaw Valley	Residential development	8 residential lots (40 bedrooms)	NOI to adopt a MND published December 2014.
Mancuso	Squaw Valley	Residential development	4 residential lots (20 bedrooms)	Pre-Development application
PlumpJack Redevelopment	Squaw Valley	Hotel and condominium expansion	104 net hotel rooms/condo bedrooms; 10,000 square feet of net new commercial	NOP released for public review in June 2015. Administrative Draft EIR currently under preparation.
Olympic Valley Museum	Squaw Valley		14,500 square feet	Pre-Development application
Alpine-Squaw Gondola	Squaw Valley	8-person gondola connecting the Alpine Meadows and Squaw Valley Ski resorts	n/a	EIR currently under review by Placer County; EIS currently under review by the U.S. Forest Service

Source: Placer County 2015a; Placer County 2015b; Town of Truckee 2016

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

As described above, cumulative impacts are two or more affects that, when combined, are considerable or compound other environmental effects. The analysis presented in the technical sections of this Draft EIR (Sections 4.1 through 4.12) determined that with the exception of Impact 4.6.2 (cumulative greenhouse gas emissions beyond year 2020), all cumulative impacts can be mitigated to less than cumulatively considerable with the implementation of mitigation measures.

REFERENCES

CARB (California Air Resource Board). 2011. *EMFAC2011 Air Quality Model*.

DOF (California Department of Finance). 2015. *E-1 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State with Annual Percent Change – January 1, 2014 and 2015*.

EIA (US Energy Information Administration). 2009. Household Energy Use in California. Accessed October 1, 2015. http://www.eia.gov/consumption/residential/reports/2009/state_briefs/pdf/CA.pdf

Placer County. 1983. *1983 Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance*.

———. 2013. *Placer County General Plan.*

———. 2015a. *Placer County CEQA Active Projects, October 2015*. Accessed January 13, 2016. http://www.placer.ca.gov/Home/CommunityDevelopment/EnvCoordSvcs/CurrentProjects.aspx.

———. 2015b. *Draft Environmental Impact Report Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan State Clearinghouse # 2012102023*.

Town of Truckee. 2016. *Major Development Projects*. Accessed January 13, 2016. http://www.townoftruckee.com/departments/planning-division/growth-and-development/major-development-projects.

US Census Bureau. 2010. *American Fact Finder, Community Facts: 96146*. Accessed July 9, 2015.

USDOE (US Department of Energy). 2013. *Alternative Fuels Data Center – Fuel Properties Comparison*. Accessed October 1, 2015. http://www.afdc.energy.gov/fuels/fuel_comparison_chart.pdf.